

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2006, which was made final. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application. Claims 57, 78, and 80 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Claims 57-75 and 77-84 are presented for examination.

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The Examiner states that the Oath is defective in this instance. Applicants respectfully disagree. The present case is a continuation-in-part of parent application 09/468,222, filed December 20, 1999, which is a continuation application of U.S. Patent 6,026,410, issued Feb. 15, 2000. On page 11, lines 1-2 of the present application Applicants explicitly incorporate by reference U.S. Patent No. 6,026,410.

The Application 09/468,222 is a continuation of U.S. Patent 6,026,410 and has an identical Specification. Therefore, the present application is properly a continuation in part of by Application '222 and Patent '410. This chain was established in the originally filed Specification.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the incorporation by reference, and continuation-in-part was properly established in the present application, and respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 60-62, 66, and 77 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided immediately when a character is entered that completes a keyword" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 7, lines 1-31; column 9, lines 51-54; and column 14. The feedback is provided by highlighting the parsed keywords, or outputting them in the shadow region.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided upon entry of a delimiter character indicating the completion of the entry of a word" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 9, lines 51-54; and column 14. The parsing continues until a delimiter character is reached which enables recognition of the completed keyword.

Support for the limitation "the feedback is provided after the message request is dispatched" is page 10, lines 6-13 of the present application.

Support for the limitation "provides guidance to the user to enter the fields appropriate to be included in the request" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 7, lines 1-31.

Support for the limitation "the individual user may add aliases for keywords which aliases are subsequently operative as keywords for that user" is shown in parent patent 6,026,410 at column 12, lines 5-24.

As noted above, the incorporation by reference was properly made in the Specification as originally filed (see Page 11, lines 1-2). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the support is proper.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 57-59, 62-65, 67-69, 71-76 and 78-79 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 to Tso, et al. (hereinafter "Tso").

Tso discloses a communications system and a method for distributing information involving a server and a client connected to a network where the server selectively sends information to the client based on a filter (Abstract). The system automatically distributes electronic information to a targeted group of users (Column 2, lines 40-42). Instead of relying on the efforts of a user to find and retrieve information, Tso allows an InfoCast server to send information or a pointer to the information such as a uniform resource locator (URL) directly to the user (Column 1, lines 44-48). What information is sent to the user is dependent on various factors, including: the location of the user; the time of day; and the information contained in a user profile (Column 1, lines 48-50). Tso thus discloses a communication system which automatically sends certain types of information to particular users, without the user explicitly requesting it. Tso does not teach or suggest a system where a user specifically requests a server to perform certain actions, and send a response, in light of those actions taken. Rather, Tso teaches away from a user sending a request, by focusing in automatically broadcast data, without requiring a user request.

The Examiner points to various places in Tso for the limitation of receiving a request message from the user. However, the referenced sections of Tso simply discuss that "InfoBites" are created and the user may request additional information based on the InfoBite received. Nowhere does Tso teach or suggest the user's message to request one or more actions to be taken by a server, based on analyzed keywords. The only action that the user of Tso can request is the full information based on the InfoBite.

The Examiner notes that "Tso clearly discloses that the user sends a message request to InfoCast server to request the user's record or information." and points to column 5, lines 16-18 and column 8, lines 48-57.

Column 5, lines 16-18 discuss a user moving between California and New York, and states that "when the user leaves the home state of the user -- the InfoCast server of the state to which the user has traveled will request a copy of the user's record from the user's home InfoCast server." That is very clear that it is the server making a request from another server. This is not in any way equivalent to a user making a request.

Column 8, lines 48-57 discusses a user being able to retrieve an article or item identified by a resource identifier. That is, in response to receiving an InfoCast, the user may request the full article. This is entirely unlike a user originated message including a request including keywords, as recited in the claims.

Applicants fail to see any suggestion in Tso of a user originated message which requests an action from the server. Instead, Tso includes messages between servers, server originated InfoCasts, and the ability by a user to respond to a server originated InfoCast.

The claims of the present invention focus on receiving a request from a user and identifying keywords in that request. As Tso does not receive user requests, Tso does not anticipate the presently pending claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 70 and 80-84 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso in view of U.S. Patent 6,151,610 to Senn.

Senn discusses a document management apparatus that includes a scripting language and controls documents based on setting attributes.

As noted above Tso does not teach or suggest a user originated message including keywords to request a server to perform certain actions. Senn does not remedy this shortcoming of Tso. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not obvious over Tso in view of Senn.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 15, 2006



Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300